

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

SAIED MOUSA RAMADAN, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
FBOP; FBOP DIRECTOR SAMUELS; )  
MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL )  
DIRECTOR EICHENLAUB; FCI )  
MCDOWELL WARDEN KAREN F. )  
HOGSTEN; FORMER FCI MCDOWELL )  
ASSOC WARDEN RATELIDGE; )  
FORMER FCI MCDOWELL ASSOC )  
WARDEN BAXTER; FORMER FCI )  
MCDOWELL CAPT STILLER; FCI )  
MCDOWELL CHAPLAIN NASH; and )  
FORMER FCI MCDOWELL CHAPLAIN )  
CONNORS, all in their Official and )  
Individual Capacities, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. 5:13-cv-02701-TLW

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Saied Mousa Ramadan filed this pro se Bivens action on October 3, 2013. (Doc. #1). This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court transfer Plaintiff’s action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia. (Doc. #20). Objections to the Report were due on January 17, 2014. Plaintiff filed no objections, and the matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and concludes that it accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #20). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this action is hereby **TRANSFERRED** to the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia. (Doc. #1). The filing fee issues, including Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Doc. #2), should be addressed by the transferee court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

September 12, 2014  
Columbia, South Carolina